

May 17, 1985

LB 126, 721

SPEAKER NICHOL: LB 721 passes with the emergency clause attached. LB 126.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on LB 126. Senator Vard Johnson would move to return 126 to Select File for specific amendment. The amendment is found on page 2340 of the Journal.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, this is not a technical amendment. This is an amendment that would, if passed, adopted and the bill was enacted, remove from 662, which I know is yesterday's news, the financing portion of 662. As you may remember where we last left off with LB 662, after the Governor signed it, is some of us decided that we would respond to the Governor's request that we remove from 662 that portion of the measure which calls for a one cent sales tax increase January 1, 1987, and that portion of the measure which calls for...which sets a maximum ceiling of property tax reliance on all school districts in our state to 45 percent. We made one attempt to deal with the financing aspect of 662, I think a day after the Governor signed it. It appeared as though passions were maybe a little warm and we failed. A couple of weeks have passed and it seems as though we may be a little more temperate in our outlook, a little more sunny. I thought I would try it again on this weatherization bill because the bill does deal with taxation and schools. So with the help of Senator Wesely, the bill's sponsor, I am introducing the amendment to repeal the financing sections of 662. Now I know there is a real division of opinion in this body as to whether or not those are...whether or not we should have the financing section in 662. There are those who say that the hammer must be left in the law to make certain that we effect school finance and property tax relief. There are others who say, that knowing we are going into special legislative session next August or September, as the case may be, to treat, specifically, school organization and finance, that there is no real need to leave the hammer in the law because we will redo it in any event. Inasmuch as a significant number of people in this body believe that a hammer that is not likely to be utilized, because the formula will ultimately be different, exists, we think it should be eliminated. Now it is a